



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,601	01/04/2001	Kenji Masaki	018775-813	1564
21839	7590	05/18/2005	EXAMINER	
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			JACKSON, JENISE E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/753,601

Applicant(s)

MASAKI, KENJI

Examiner

Jenise E. Jackson

Art Unit

2131

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED _____ FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-10.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the Applicant's remarks are unpersuasive. The Applicant states that Kakiuchi does not disclose a second controller. Kakiuchi was not relied on for the second controller, Nagashima was relied on for the second controller(see action above).

11. The Applicant states that Kakiuchi et al. does not disclose a first controller that functions to determine whether data on output request passes the driver software, in sending data to the output device. The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant. Kakiuchi discloses a controller that includes an examination means that determines whether data passes the driver software by determining whether data is sent to the output device(see col. 3, lines 23-44). The output device of Kakiuchi is the printer(see col. 3, lines 45-67).

12. The Applicant states that Nagashima does not disclose a second controller that prohibits data from being sent to an output device or output request on which data bypasses the driver software. The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant. Nagashima discloses an image processing circuit that includes a forgery preventing mode, that determines if the copying is a forgery copying is prevented for performing. This forgery prevention mode is a part of the controller(see col. 3, lines 50-65). The Examiner asserts that the bypassing the driver it the forgery prevention of Nagashima. Nagashima does prohibits printing by determining whether forgery has occurred, if it has determined that forgery has occurred copying/printing is disabled(see col. 3, lines 50-65).

13. The Applicant's argument as per claim 3, is persuasive. Nagashima discloses setting a value if the image data is recognized to be counterfeit. Prior art fails to disclose setting a value to be output to an output device. The prior art discloses setting a value to determine whether the object is a fake or forgery. Therefore, this claim is allowed for the feature of "setting a value"...

14. The Applicant states that Nagashima et al. does not disclose an encryptor for encrypting data passing the driver software, but not for encrypting data sent to the output device that bypasses the driver software. Nagashima et al. discloses that encryption/decryption is performed in the controller(see col. 3, lines 51-55). Nagashima et al. does not disclose that encryption is performed all the time. Nagashima discloses that a determining circuit executes forgery determination, it does not disclose that in the forgery determination encryption is done(see col. 4, lines 54-63).

15. Lastly, installing driver software, is inherent, because Kakiuchi et al. and Nagashima disclose drivers. Furthermore, Kakiuchi discloses a printer driver software which is installed in a hard disk(see col. 7, lines 60-62).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jenise E Jackson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3791. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.) alternate Friday's.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.

Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for

unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see [http://pair-](http://pair-direct.uspto.gov)

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May 13, 2005


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100